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Roadmap: 3 research questions about ergativity

- **what is the nature of ERG=GEN and ERG=POSS?**
  - a typological description of the phenomenon
  - how common is it? (sample of 40 ergative languages)
  - comparison with a sample of 40 accusative languages

- **can existing theories of case and agreement account for all these syncretic patterns?**
  - Marantz-Bobaljik model of case and agreement
  - ergative patterns: yes
  - all the rest: no

- **what is the relationship between morphological ergativity and syntactic ergativity?**
  - basic description of the phenomena
  - existing theories posit a close relationship between ME and SE
  - my hypothesis: extraction asymmetries serve a disambiguating function
  - the link between morphological alignment and extraction asymmetries is severed
Roadmap: 3 research questions about ergativity

• what is the nature of ERG=GEN and ERG=POSS?
  → a typological description of the phenomenon
  → how common is it? (sample of 40 ergative languages)
  → comparison with a sample of 40 accusative languages

• can existing theories of case and agreement account for all these syncretic patterns?
  → Marantz-Bobaljik model of case and agreement
  → ergative patterns: yes
  → all the rest: no

• what is the relationship between morphological ergativity and syntactic ergativity?
  → basic description of the phenomena
  → existing theories posit a close relationship between ME and SE
  → my hypothesis: extraction asymmetries serve a disambiguating function
  → the link between morphological alignment and extraction asymmetries is severed
(1) *Schema of ergative (L) and accusative (R) alignment*

\[ \ldots \text{typically in either case marking or verb agreement} \]
Shipibo

(Valenzuela 2003; p.325, p.203)

(2) a. \textit{jiwi-n-ra Sani rishki-ke}
   \hspace{1cm} \textit{tree-\textsc{erg-ev} Sani hit-\textsc{cmpl}}
   \hspace{1cm} ‘the tree hit Sani’

b. \textit{isá-ra noya-i}
   \hspace{1cm} \textit{bird-\textsc{ev} fly-\textsc{inc}}
   \hspace{1cm} ‘the/a bird is flying’
Kaqchikel

(3) a. $x$- $i$- $ru$- $tijo$ -$j$
PERF 1SGABS 3SGERG teach TRANS
‘she taught me’

b. $x$- $i$- $wär$
PERF 1SGABS sleep
‘I slept’

c. $x$- $∅$- $wär$
PERF 3SGABS sleep
‘she slept’
• last question: *what is the relationship between morphological ergativity and syntactic ergativity?*
• what is an ergative extraction asymmetry a.k.a. “syntactic ergativity”?

• it involves $\bar{A}$-extraction:

(4) a. $[\text{CP} \quad \text{what did} \quad [\text{IP} \quad \text{John eat} \quad t \quad ] ]$ (Wh-question)

        \[ \downarrow \]

        b. $\text{the sandwich} \quad [\text{CP} \quad \text{OP that} \quad [\text{IP} \quad \text{John ate} \quad t \quad ] ]$ (relative clause)

        \[ \downarrow \]

        c. $\text{it was} \quad [\text{CP} \quad \text{a sandwich that} \quad [\text{IP} \quad \text{John ate} \quad t \quad ] ]$ (focus fronting/clefting)
• Ā-extraction of the transitive subject alone is morphologically marked:

Kaqchikel

(5) a. achike x-tz’ët-on ri achin
   Wh   PERF-see-AF DET man
   ‘who saw the man?’

   b. achike x-u-tz’ët ri achin
       Wh   PERF-3SGE-see DET man
       ‘who did the man see?’

   c. achike x-∅-wär
       Wh   PERF-sleep
       ‘who slept?’
• A-extraction of the transitive subject alone is **morphologically marked**:

Kaqchikel

(6) a. \( ri \ wakx \ [ ri \ x-tz\'et-on \ ri \ achin ] \)
   DET cow       C PERF-see-AF DET man
   ‘the cow that saw the man’

b. \( ri \ wakx \ [ ri \ x-u-tz\'et \ ri \ achin ] \)
   DET cow       C PERF-3SGE-see DET man
   ‘the cow that the man saw’

c. \( ri \ wakx \ [ ri \ x-w\'ar ] \)
   DET cow       C PERF-sleep
   ‘the cow that slept’
• Ā-extraction of the transitive subject alone is **morphologically marked**:

(Gitksan) (Rigsby 1986; p.303, p.303, p.303)

(7) a. `nā ʔan=t qay ɬəmoo=s Bruce
   who A.REL=3sg which help=CNN Bruce
   ‘who helped Bruce?’

b. `nā=t ɬw əmoo-yə-n
   who=CNN help-TR-2SG
   ‘who did you help?’

    c. `nā=t lim-ət
       who=CNN sing-S.REL
       ‘who sang?’
● Ā-extraction of the transitive subject alone is morphologically marked:

Gitksan (Rigsby 1986; p.404, p.407, p.405)

(8) a.  

\[
\begin{align*}
ka?&\text{-}\text{-}\text{y}=1 & \text{kat} & [ \text{?an}\text{-}\text{cak}^w\text{-}\text{y}=1 & \text{naks}\text{-}\text{t}] \\
\text{see-TRN-1SG}=\text{CNN} & \text{man} & A.\text{REL}\text{-}\text{kill-INCR}=\text{CNN} & \text{spouse-3SG} \\
\text{‘I saw the man who killed his wife’}
\end{align*}
\]

b.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mal}\text{-}\text{t}\text{-}\text{y} & \text{lo}\text{-}\text{tit} & \text{tim} & \text{k}^w\text{i}\text{x}^w\text{-}\text{y}=s & \text{John}=1 & \text{smax} & [ \text{t}\text{-}\text{\text{ka}?-n} ] \\
\text{tell-TRN-1SG} & \text{OBL-3PL} & \text{FUT} & \text{shoot-TRN}=\text{CNN} & \text{John}=\text{CNN} & \text{bear} & \text{DEF-see-2SG} \\
\text{‘I told them that John would shoot the bear that you saw’}
\end{align*}
\]

c.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tim} & \text{t}\text{-}\text{is}\text{-}\text{y}=1 & \text{xa}?=1 & \text{kat}=1 & [ \text{pax}\text{-}\text{\text{et}=k}\text{\text{o}} ] \\
\text{FUT} & \text{hit-TRN}=\text{CNN} & \text{slave}=\text{CNN} & \text{man}=\text{CNN} & \text{run-S.\text{REL}=DIST} \\
\text{‘the slave will hit the man who ran’}
\end{align*}
\]
• not all morphologically ergative languages have an extraction asymmetry!

Niuean (Seiter 1980; p.29, p.28)

(9) a. *ne kai he pusi ia e moa*
    PST eat ERG cat that ABS chicken
    ‘that cat ate the chicken’

b. *malona tuai e kapiniu ē*
    broken PERF ABS dish this
    ‘this dish is broken’
• not all morphologically ergative languages have an extraction asymmetry!

Niuean (Seiter 1980; p.109, p.110; p.110)

(10) a. ko hai ne fifili a koe ke vagahau
   PRED who NFT choose ABS you SUB speak
   ‘who chose you to speak?’

b. ko hai ne fahi e Sione
   PRED who NFT beat ERG Sione
   ‘who did Sione beat?’

c. ko hai ne nofo he fale kō
   PRED who NFT live in house that
   ‘who lives in that house?’
• not all morphologically ergative languages have an extraction asymmetry!

Niuean  
(Seiter 1980; p.246, p.246; p.246)

(11) a. *kehe* *tama* [ *ka* *kai* e *tau* *pateta* ]
   to child FUT eat ABS PL potato
   ‘to the child who is going to eat the potatoes’

b. *mo* e *tagata* [ *ne* *moto* e *koe* ]
   with ABS person NFT punch ERG you
   ‘with the person who you punched’

c. *e* *tama* [ *ne* *hau* i *Makefu* ]
   ABS child NFT come LOC Makefu
   ‘the child who comes from Makefu’
• some languages only show an extraction asymmetry in a subset of environments!

West Greenlandic (Bittner & Hale 1996; p.17, p.17)

(12) a. *juuna-p miiqqa-t paar(i-v)-a-i
    Juuna-ERG child-PL.ABS look.after-IND-TR-3SG.3PL
    ‘Juuna is looking after the children’

b. *arna-t mirsur-p-u-t
    woman-PL.ABS sew-IND-INTR-3PL
    ‘the women are sewing’
some languages only show an extraction asymmetry in a subset of environments!

West Greenlandic

(Fortescue 1984; p.23, p.16, p.24)

(13) a. kia uqaatig-AA
    who.ERG talk.about-3SG.3SG.INTER
    ‘who talked about it?’

b. suna=ana Jaaku-p siulittaasu-u-vvigi-gaa
    what=that Jaaku-ERG chairman-be-have.as.place.of-3SG.SG.PART
    ‘what is Jaaku chairman of?’

c. kina tikis-sinnaa-va
    who come-can-3SG.INTER
    ‘who can come?’
• some languages only show an extraction asymmetry in a subset of environments!

West Greenlandic

(Bok-Bennema 1991; p.69, p.65, p.239)

(14) a. \(\text{piniartuq}\) \([\text{nannu-mik} \quad \text{tuqut-si-suq}]\)
    \begin{align*}
    \text{hunter.Abs} & \quad \text{polar.bear-mod \ kill-AP-PART} \\
    \text{‘the hunter who killed the polar bear’}
    \end{align*}

b. \(\text{nanuq}\) \([\text{Piita-p} \quad \text{tuqu-ta-a}]\)
    \begin{align*}
    \text{polar.bear.Abs} & \quad \text{Piita-erg \ kill-part-3SG} \\
    \text{‘the polar bear that Piita killed’}
    \end{align*}

c. \([\text{ipis-suq}]\)
    \begin{align*}
    \text{be.sharp-PART} \\
    \text{‘the thing that is sharp’}
    \end{align*}
• the mystery, from a typological perspective:

(15) *Morphological ergativity and ergative extraction asymmetries: 3 types of languages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>morphological ergativity</th>
<th>ergative extraction asymmetry</th>
<th>Wh-question</th>
<th>relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaqchikel, Gitksan, Selayarese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Greenlandic, Roviana, Shipibo</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuean, Yukulta, Basque</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• how to account for these facts?

• maybe the answer lies in the assignment of morphological case

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
O \\
S
\end{array}
\]
Tagalog

(16) *b-in-ili ng babae ang isda*  
-TR.PERF-buy ERG woman ABS fish  
‘the woman bought the fish’

- a ‘blocking’ account, Aldridge (2008):
(17) Two types of ergative languages

a. (adapted from Polinsky 2016; p.46, p.48)

- ergative as ‘null P’ account, Polinsky (2016)
(18) The case-discrimination hierarchy in Deal (2016)

unmarked case $\gg$ dependent case $\gg$ lexical/oblique case

- case discrimination account, Deal (2016)
- for every type of $\bar{A}$-extraction, attracting head must Agree with extracting XP first
- in some languages, dependent (ergative) morphological case is ineligible for Agree
• a ‘blocking’ account, Aldridge (2008)

• ergative as ‘null P’ account, Polinsky (2016)

• case discrimination account, Deal (2016)

→ all these approaches have one thing in common: the explanation for ergative extraction asymmetry is found in the assignment of **morphological case**

→ ...but are they missing the bigger picture?
• a new approach: the **disambiguation hypothesis**

• “these asymmetries serve primarily as a **grammaticalized disambiguation strategy** in ambiguous extraction scenarios. The presence of an ergative extraction asymmetry is predicted by a language’s typological profile – a combination of basic word order, Wh-strategy, relativization strategy, and morphological case”

• if ̅A-extraction is *a priori* ambiguous, an extraction asymmetry is predicted to occur

• if the language’s typological profile is such that ̅A-extraction is not ambiguous, no extraction asymmetry is predicted to occur
Language $X_1$ (VSO, $\times$ m-case, Wh-fronting)

(19) a. $\text{WH}?$ \quad V \quad t \quad \text{NP}$

\[\text{transitive subject (A) extraction}\]

b. $\text{WH}?$ \quad V \quad \text{NP} \quad t$

\[\text{transitive object (O) extraction}\]

c. $\text{WH}_S$ \quad V \quad t

\[\text{intransitive subject (S) extraction}\]
Language X₂ (VSO, ✗ m-case, Wh-fronting)

(20) a. \( \text{WH}_A \quad x \quad V \quad t \quad \text{NP} \)  
transitive subject (A) extraction

b. \( \text{WH}_O \quad V \quad \text{NP} \quad t \)  
transitive object (O) extraction

c. \( \text{WH}_S \quad V \quad t \)  
intransitive subject (S) extraction
Language $X_3$ (VSO, ✔ m-case, Wh-fronting)

(21) a. $V \ NP_{\text{ERG}} \ NP_{\text{ABS}}$  
    
    b. $Wh_{\text{ERG}} \ V \ NP_{\text{ABS}}$  
    transitive subject (A) extraction

    c. $Wh_{\text{ABS}} \ V \ NP_{\text{ERG}}$  
    transitive object (O) extraction

    d. $Wh_{\text{ABS}} \ V$  
    intransitive subject (S) extraction
Language $X_4$ (SOV, $\times$ m-case, Wh-\textit{in situ})

(22) a. $\text{NP}_A \quad \text{NP}_O \quad V$  \hspace{1cm} basic clause
b. $\text{Wh}_A \quad \text{NP}_O \quad V$  \hspace{1cm} transitive subject ($A$) extraction
c. $\text{NP}_A \quad \text{Wh}_O \quad V$  \hspace{1cm} transitive object ($O$) extraction
d. $\text{Wh}_S \quad V$  \hspace{1cm} intransitive subject ($S$) extraction
• a language’s **typological profile** predicts whether an ergative extraction asymmetry should occur

• test out these predictions in a larger sample!

• new sample: 53 total languages (34 of them from Chapter 2)
(23) **Morphologically ergative languages in the extraction asymmetry sample** (n=53)

Chapters 2 & 5: Abkhaz, Ayutla Mixe, Basque, Burushaski, Canela-Kraho, Cavineña, Epena Pedee, Georgian, Gitksan, Halkomelem, Hindi, Hua, Itzaj, Kaluli, Kapampangan, Kaqchikel, Lezgian, Lhasa Tibetan, Ngiyambaa, Niuean, Paumarí, Seediq, Shipibo, Sinaugoro, Sm’algyax, Sorani Kurdish, Suena, Tiriyó, Trumai, Yakima Sahaptin, Yingkarta, Yukulta, Warlpiri, West Greenlandic

Chapter 5 only: Apinajé, Belhare, Cupeño, Diyari, Drehu, Ixil, Katukina, Kuikuro, Karitiána, Kolyma Yukaghir, Lillooet, Matses, Movima, Q’anjob’al, Roviana, Selayarese, Tseltal, Tukang Besi, Yucatec
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Yukulta (Keen 1972; p.174, p.175, p.226)

(24)  a. $\eta$aka-ya $=t$ukanta kurka $\eta$itjinta milyalta
   who-ERG =1SG.3SG.PAST take 1SG.POSS spear
   ‘who took my spear?’

   b. $\eta$aka $=yikanti$ yanma $\tilde{t}$iya
   what =2SG.FUT today.INTERR eat
   ‘what will you eat today?’

   c. $\eta$aka-yana $=n$iyki puri
   who-DUB 3SG.FUT come
   ‘I don’t know who will come’
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Georgian (Foley 2013; p.9, p.9 / Aronson 1991; p.285)

(25) a. moscavale [ romel-ma=c qovelvis icis pasuxi ]
   student which-ERG=REL always know.PRES.3SG answer
   ‘the student which always knows the answer’

   b. kali [ romeli=c gušin Eka-m naxa ]
   woman which=REL yesterday Eka-ERG see.AOR.3SG
   ‘the woman who Eka saw yesterday’

   c. k’aci [ romeli=c lap’araka’ob-d-a ]
   man which=REL he-was-speaking
   ‘the man who was speaking’
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Lillooet (Davis et al 1993; p.86, p.83 / Roberts 1994; p.30)

(26) a. ŝwat kʷu á¢x-ən-táli ta nkyáp-a
    who IRR see-TR-TOP DET coyote-DET
    ‘who saw the coyote?’

b. štam kʷu á¢x-ən-aš
    what IRR see-TR-3SG.ERG
    ‘what did she see?’

c. ŝwat skíczaʔ qwatsáts
    who mother leave
    ‘whose mother left?’
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Selayarese

(Finer 1998; p.291, p.291/ D. Finer, p.c.)

\[(27)\]

\[a. \quad \underline{pakoko} \quad [\quad \underline{to-la-pallu-ñjo-i} \quad juku?-\text{na} \quad ]\]
\begin{align*}
\text{farmer} & \quad \text{REL-3ERG-cook-DEF-3ABS fish-3POSS} \\
\text{‘the farmer who cooked his fish’}
\end{align*}

\[b. \quad juku? \quad [\quad \underline{nu-la-pallu-ñjo} \quad i \quad Ali \quad ]\]
\begin{align*}
\text{fish} & \quad \text{REL-3ERG-cook-DEF DET Ali} \\
\text{‘the fish Ali cooked’}
\end{align*}

\[c. \quad \underline{tedong} \quad [\quad \underline{nu-ak-kelong-ñjo} \quad ]\]
\begin{align*}
\text{buffalo} & \quad \text{REL-INT-sing-DEF} \\
\text{‘the buffalo who sang’}
\end{align*}

\[\rightarrow \ldots \text{the restriction doesn’t have to be on extraction of A element!}\]

\[34 / 57\]
the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Roviana (Waterhouse 1928; p.39, p.233, p.146)

(28) a. *esei hoper-i-a sa igana hie*
   who spear-TR-3SGOBJ DEF fish DEM
   ‘who speared this fish?’

b. *na sa si kaqu tepa-i-a rau*
   DEF what FOC FUT ask.for-TR-3SGOBJ 1SG.ERG
   ‘what shall I ask it?’

c. *esei si zukezuke hoi*
   who FOC torch.REDUP there
   ‘who is that with a torch?’
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Roviana  (Corston-Oliver 2003; p.275, p.275, p.275)

(29)  a. *hierana* sa *koreo* [ sapu *tupa-na* e *zone* ]
    this DEF boy REL punch-*3SG.NSUF* PERS John
    ‘this is the boy that punched John’

b. *hierana* sa *koreo* [ sapu *tupa-i-a* e *zone* ]
    this DEF boy REL punch-*TR-3SG.OBJ* PERS John
    ‘this is the boy that John punched’

c. *hierana* sa *tie* [ sapu *kote* *taloa* ]
    this DEF man REL FUT leave
    ‘this is the man who is going away’

→ ...can account for environment asymmetries!
• the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Shipibo

(Valenzuela 2003; p.482, p.483)

(30) a. [pitso-n bake natex-a] -tonin-ra joshin pike
    parakeet-ERG child.ABS bite-PP2 ERG-EV banana.ABS eat-CMPL
    ‘the child the parakeet bit ate he banana’
    * ‘the parakeet that bit the child ate the banana’

    b. [mi-bé ainbo jo-a] -ra no-n onan-yama-ke
    2-COM woman.ABS come-PP2.ABS EV 1P-ERG know-NEG-CMPL
    ‘we don’t know the woman who came with you’
the disambiguation hypothesis makes good predictions!

Shipibo (Valenzuela 2002; p.67)

(31) [ bake natex-a pitso-n-ra joshin pi-ke ]
    child.ABS bite-PP2 parakeet-ERG-EV banana.ABS eat-CMPL
    ‘the parakeet that bit the child ate the banana’
...and yet disambiguation alone cannot account for all the data in the sample.

(32) Data points (n=8) where the disambiguation hypothesis makes an incorrect prediction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraction asymmetry is predicted, but does not occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itzaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseltal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraction asymmetry is not predicted, but occurs anyways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katukina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukang Besi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Greenlandic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• some languages simply tolerate ambiguity! (incorrect prediction) :(  

Itzaj  

(Hofling 2000; p.422/ A. Hofling, p.c.)

(33)  

a. maax t-uy-il-aj  
   who COM-3A-see-CTS  
   ‘who saw him?’ or ‘who did he see?’

b. b’alum [ a’ t-u-kin-s-aj a’ winik-e ]  
   jaguar DET COM-3A-die-CAUS-DTS DET man-TOP  
   ‘a jaguar that killed the man’ or ‘a jaguar that the man killed’
• there may exist independent constraints that produce an extraction asymmetry!
  (incorrect prediction) :

Katukina  

(34) a. \textit{pi:da na=ti paiko}  
  \hspace{1cm} \textit{jaguar ERG=kill grandfather}  
  \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘the jaguar killed grandfather’}  

b. \textit{tyuku wa:pa}  
  \hspace{1cm} \textit{die dog}  
  \hspace{1cm} \textit{‘the dog died’}  

(Queixalós 2010; p.217, p.217)
• there may exist independent constraints that produce an extraction asymmetry!

(incorrect prediction) :(

Katukina

(Queixalós 2010; p.258, p.245, p.245)

(35) a. itiyan kawahiri kana wa-duni tyon
    this cat FOC ANTI-catch rat
    ‘it’s this cat that caught the rat’

b. a-obatyawa kana Aro na=nuhuk kariwa
    3SG-wife FOC Aro ERG=give white.man
    ‘it’s his own wife that Aro gave to the white man’

c. Maranmaran na=tyo kana tona tyo
    Maranmaran GEN=daughter FOC go.away EXCL
    ‘it’s Maranmaran’s daughter that went away!’
(36) The disambiguation hypothesis & the ergative sample: results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># data points</th>
<th>% correct</th>
<th>% extraction asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all ergative data</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90/98 = 91.8%</td>
<td>42/98 = 42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-questions</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45/49 = 91.8%</td>
<td>16/49 = 32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-initial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14/17 = 82.3%</td>
<td>12/17 = 70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-medial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9/10 = 90.0%</td>
<td>3/10 = 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-final</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22/22 = 100.0%</td>
<td>1/22 = 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative clauses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45/49 = 91.8%</td>
<td>26/49 = 51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-initial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16/19 = 84.2%</td>
<td>16/19 = 84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-medial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/8 = 100%</td>
<td>3/8 = 37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-final</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21/22 = 95.4%</td>
<td>7/22 = 31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• the disambiguation hypothesis goes beyond morphological alignment!

Nehan (Glennon 2014; p.19, p.44)

(37) a. o keketik k-e-eit=isi=r kilon
    ART.PL child PERF-3SG-bite=PL.P=LIG coconut.crab
    ‘the coconut crab bit the children’

b. k-e-la manasa=mpe inggon
    PERF-3SG-go now=EMP 3SG
    ‘he went now indeed’
the disambiguation hypothesis goes beyond morphological alignment!

(38) a. \( \text{mai=}s \ k-a-kuse \ tang \ Pita \)
   who=3pl PERF-3pl-hold OBL Peter
   ‘who arrested Peter?’

b. \( \text{mai} \ k-a-kuse=in=r \ polis \)
   who PERF-3pl-hold=3sg=LIG police
   ‘who did the police arrest?’

c. \( \text{mai} \ k-e-la \)
   who PERF-3sg-go
   ‘who went?’

NOM-ACC language, but transitive subject extraction is marked!

Nehan (Glennon 2014; p.107, p.107, p.107)
• the disambiguation hypothesis goes beyond morphological alignment!

Kuikuro

(39) a. u-ahetinhomba-tagü i-heke
   1ABS-help-CONT 3-ERG
   ‘he is helping me’

b. u-ünkgü-tagü
   1ABS-sleep-CONT
   ‘I am sleeping’

(Franchetto 2010; p.124, p.124)
the disambiguation hypothesis goes beyond morphological alignment!

Kuikuro (Franchetto 2010; p.145, p.145, p.144)

(40) a. \textit{u-ingåtzu-ha ekise-i hikutaha enge-ni-}mb"ung"ü
\[\text{1-sister-AF 3D-COP turtle eat-AGNR-SUBS}\]
‘it was my sister who ate the turtle’

b. \textit{hikutaha-ha ege-i u-ingåtzu ng-enge-tag"u}
\[\text{turtle-AF DDIST-COP 1-sister OM-eat-CONT}\]
‘it was a turtle that my sister was eating’

c. \textit{u-ingåtzu-ha ekise-i t-iniluN-ta-tinh"u-i}
\[\text{1-sister-AF 3D-COP 3AN-cry-CONT-PTP-PNR-COP}\]
‘it was my sister who was crying’

ERG-ABS language, but transitive object extraction is marked!
• the disambiguation hypothesis goes beyond morphological alignment!

Nuuchahnulth (Davidson 2002; p.145, p.145, p.144)

(41) a. \([ yaq^wmit=i:tq \text{ qah}-sa:p \ t’ux-šiχ ] \)
   one.who=PAST=DEF dead-CAUS.PERF kill.from.hiding-PERF
   ‘the one who had killed him from ambush’

b. \([ yaq^w-či=pit=i:tq \text{ qah}-sa:p \ t’ux-šiχ ] \)
   one.who-do.to=PAST=DEF dead-CAUS.PERF kill.from.hiding-PERF
   ‘the one he had killed from ambush’

c. \([ yaq^w-čuq-(y)a=i:tq ] \)
   that.which-in.mouth=CONT=DEF
   ‘that which is in one’s mouth’

NOM-ACC language, and transitive object extraction is marked!
(42) *Extraction asymmetries and morphological alignment: all four logical possibilities are attested*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>morphologically ergative</th>
<th>morphologically accusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ergative extraction asymmetry</td>
<td>many examples</td>
<td>Nehan, Bella Coola, Cocama, Southern Pomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative extraction asymmetry</td>
<td>Kuikuro, Karitiâna</td>
<td>Nuuchahnulth, Sandawe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• summary of arguments against morphological case accounts

• cannot account for morphological diversity of ergative extraction asymmetries
  ◦ ex.: Yucatec, Selayarese, Ayutla Mixe

• cannot account for domain asymmetries between Wh-questions and relative clauses
  ◦ ex.: Roviana, Trumai, Tiriyó

• cannot account for internally-headed relative clause restrictions
  ◦ ex.: Shipibo, Belhare, Apinajé

• cannot account for ergative extraction asymmetries in accusative languages
  ◦ ex.: Nehan, Bella Coola, Cocama, Southern Pomo

• cannot account for accusative extraction asymmetries in ergative languages
  ◦ ex.: Kuikuro, Karitiâna
• what is the relationship between morphological ergativity and syntactic ergativity?
  → basic description of the phenomena
  → existing theories posit a close relationship between ME and SE
  → my hypothesis: extraction asymmetries serve a disambiguating function
  → the link between morphological alignment and extraction asymmetries is severed
Thank you!
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